UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,905	03/31/2004	Wen-Jian Lin	QCO.094A/061113	9293
59747 7590 05/30/2008 KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP 2040 MAIN STREET			EXAMINER	
			TRAN, HOANG Q	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2874		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/815,905	LIN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	HOANG TRAN	2874				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 January 2008</u> . 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-19 is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 20-28 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) applicant may not request that any objection to a	awn from consideration. id/or election requirement. niner. accepted or b) □ objected to b					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/08/2008.	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ·ormal Patent Application -				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20-21, 23 and 26-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable by Applicant Admitted Prior art (Figure 1) in view Pei (US 2004/0263028 A1).

In terms of claim 20, Applicant admitted prior art discloses an interferometer modulation pixel comprising a first electrode (Fig. 1: '102'), a movable second electrode '104' being situated above the first electrode and being parallel to the first electrode (Figure 2); two supports (106, 102) between the first electrode and the second electrode to form a cavity (108) between the first and second electrodes (102 and 104); Applicant Admitted Prior art does not teach an hybdrophobic layer. Pei teaches a hydrophobic (291 and 292) are being used on a cavity-side surface of the first electrode (Para [172 and 173] and electrode 295) in this instant the hydrophobic layer will be use on electrodes 295. A motivation for such an application is to prevent water from interacting with the electrode and (arm 291 and 292) in order to produce fix mechanic movement in the interferometer arms. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Pei with

hydrophobic polymers and electrodes to make mechanical moving arm in an interferometer.

As to claim 21 and 23, Applicant admitted prior art is silent to the hydrophobic layer. Pei teaches an optical device comprises a hydrophobic organic compound having at least a hydrogen atom being capable of forming hydrogen bonds with oxygen or nitrogen atoms (Para [0195]). Further Pei teaches the polymer arms act as an insulator dielectric to the electrode [0064]. **A motivation** for such an application is to prevent water from interacting with the electrode and (arm 291 and 292) in order to produce fix mechanic movement in the interferometer arms. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Pei with hydrophobic polymers and electrodes to make mechanical moving arm in an interferometer.

As to claim 26-28, the first electrode comprises a transparent conductive layer, a light-absorption layer, and an insulating layer (Para [0187]), and wherein the movable second electrode is a light-reflection electrode (Para [0187]) having a hydrophobic layer prevents the first electrode from adsorbing water molecules (Para [0195]).

Claims 22, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art in view of Pei et al. (US 2004/0263028 A1) further in view of Peterson et al. (US 6,335,224 B1).

Regarding claim 22, 24-25, Pei discloses the invention of claim 20, however, Pei does not explicitly disclose the molecular compound of the hydrophobic organic

Application/Control Number: 10/815,905 Page 4

Art Unit: 2874

compound comprises silanes including hexamethyl disilane. Peterson discloses in the Abstract that the microelectronic device is protected by a water adsorption resistant coating that can be chosen from a list of compounds including hexamethyl disilane for the compound exhibit the desired property of resistant to water adsorption.

Furthermore, Peterson discloses the insulating layer comprises silicon nitride and the hydrophobic layer is positioned on the insulating layer (Fig. 2B '26'). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to recognize the teaching of Peterson would be applicable to the art of Pei in modifying Pei's prior art. The motivation for using the compounds as claimed is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art for it's property of resisting water adsorption and is clearly taught in Peterson's prior art that such material is used to collectively package and protect the microelectronic devices.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see remarks section, filed 01/25/2008 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 20 under 35 USC 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made wherein the applicant admitted prior art was applied (See applicant Specification Figure 1 and 2). Pei was use as a secondary reference to introduce the hydrophobic limitations described in Claim 1 since Pei use a similar application in his optical device.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/815,905 Page 5

Art Unit: 2874

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-5049. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM - 5:00 PM.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hoang Tran/ Examiner, Art Unit 2874

/Sung H. Pak/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2874

Application Number

Application/Control No.		Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination		
	10/815,905	LIN ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	HOANG TRAN	2874		